## REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6-10, 12-19, 21, 23-30, 32-34, 37-41, 43-45, 48-52, and 54-57 are now pending in the application, of which claims 1, 24, 37, 48, 50, 51, 52, 54 and 55 are independent. Claims 56 and 57 have been added. Support for claims 56 and 57 may be found at page 17, lines 12-25 of the Specification. No new matter has been added.

Applicants urge that all of the claims are patentable and in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action claims 1-34, 37-45 and 48-55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,868,526 to Singh (hereafter "Singh") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,912,707 to Fontes (hereafter "Fontes"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 4, 5, 11, 20, 22, 31, 35, 36, 42, 46, 47 and 53 have been previously canceled. Therefore, the above § 103 rejection of these claims is moot.

A. Claim 1

Claim 1 recites:

1.      A method comprising:
        receiving an input for selecting a first graphical object in an executable block diagram representing a system, the first graphical object having one or more properties;
        ***displaying a list of one or more transformation operations performable on the first graphical object for transforming the first graphical object into a second graphical object for the executable block diagram***;
        receiving an input for selecting one of the one or more transformation operations; and
        applying the selected one of the one or more transformation operations on the first graphical object for creating the second graphical object, the second graphical object having one or more properties that are different from the one or more properties of the first graphical object.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to showing that Singh and Fontes taken either, alone or in any reasonable combination, disclose or suggest the following feature of claim 1: ***displaying a list of***

*one or more transformation operations performable on the first graphical object for transforming the first graphical object into a second graphical object for the executable block diagram.*

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that Singh does not expressly disclose this claim feature. (Office Action, page 3, ¶ 2). The Examiner relies on Fontes to disclose or suggest this claim feature. However, the Examiner does not indicate where exactly Fontes discloses or teaches this claim feature. Applicants respectfully urge that the Fontes fails to cure the shortcomings of Singh with respect to disclosing or suggesting Applicants' claimed *displaying a list of one or more transformation operations performable on the first graphical object for transforming the first graphical object into a second graphical object for the executable block diagram.*

Fontes describes a process that includes comparing a first Computer Assisted Drafting (CAD) drawing with a second CAD drawing, determining a difference between the first and second CAD drawings, and selectively altering the first CAD drawing to indicate the difference. (Figure 9 and Column 5, lines 47-54). In Figure 19 and at column 10, line 56 to column 11, line 3, Fontes describes this process in general steps. Nowhere does Fontes disclose or suggest, though, that these general steps may be used to transform *a first graphical object into a second graphical object for an executable block diagram.* Rather, Fontes merely suggests and discloses that the process may be applied to CAD drawings which are not the same as graphical objects of an executable block diagram.

Applicants, on the other hand, claim *first and second graphical objects*, which are part of an *executable block diagram.* The blocks may be executed to simulate a system represented by the executable block diagram. The simulation may produce simulation results. (See Applicants' Specification, page 9, lines 8-21 and page 10, lines 17-34, for example). Fontes provides no disclosure of suggesting that his CAD drawings may do the same. Thus, Fontes' CAD drawings are not the same as the Applicants' claimed *first and second graphical objects* which are part of *an executable block diagram.*

Regarding *displaying a list of one or more transformation operations performable on the first graphical object for transforming the first graphical object into a second graphical object for the executable block diagram*, nowhere does Fontes disclose *displaying a list of*

*transformation operations* that may be performed on *graphical objects in an executable block diagram*. As such, the combination of Singh and Fontes do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1.

The Examiner further alleges that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Singh and Fontes to create documents and resolve differences between drawing revisions faster. (Office Action, page 3, last ¶). Applicants respectfully urge that the transformation operations performed on the graphical object of an executable block diagram is not a mere drawing revision as alleged by the Examiner.

For reasons set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to showing that Singh and Fontes, taken either alone or in any reasonable combination disclose or suggest *displaying a list of one or more transformation operations performable on the first graphical object for transforming the first graphical object into a second graphical object for the executable block diagram*, which is present in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above §103 rejection of claim 1.

### B. Claims 2, 3, 6-10, 12-19 and 21-23

Claims 2, 3, 6-10, 12-19 and 21-23 depend from claim 1 and, as such, incorporate each and every element of claim 1. Applicants respectfully urge that claims 2, 3, 6-10, 12-19 and 21-23 are therefore allowable for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above §103 rejection of claims 2, 3, 6-10, 12-19 and 21-23.

### C. Claims 24-30, 32-34, 37-41, 43-45, 48-52, 54 and 55

Independent claims 24, 37, 48, 50, 51, 52, 54 and 55 recite features similar to the features set forth in claim 1. For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully urge that Singh and Fontes, taken either alone or in any reasonable combination fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 24, 37, 48, 50, 51, 52, 54 and 55.

Dependent claims 25-30, 32-34, 38-41, 43-45 and 49 incorporate each and every element of the independent claim upon which they depend. Thus, Applicants respectfully urge that claims 25-30, 32-34, 38-41, 43-45 and 49 are therefore allowable for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claims 24, 37, 48, 50, 51, 52, 54 and 55.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above § 103 rejection of claims 24-30, 32-34, 37-41, 43-45, 48-52, 54 and 55.

## CONCLUSION

In view of the above comments, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance and urge the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance. Should the Examiner feel that a teleconference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' attorney at (617) 227-7400.

Please charge any shortage or credit any overpayment of fees to our Deposit Account No. 12-0080, under Order No. MWS-089RCE. In the event that a petition for an extension of time is required to be submitted herewith, and the requisite petition does not accompany this response, the undersigned hereby petitions under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render this submission timely. Any fee due is authorized to be charged to the aforementioned Deposit Account.

Dated: April 17, 2008                           Respectfully submitted,

By /Neslihan I. Doran/
Neslihan I. Doran
Registration No.: L0389
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
One Post Office Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02109-2127
(617) 227-7400
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicant